

Appl. No. 10/774,474
Amdt. dated March 19, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 9, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 5-16, and 19-37 are currently in the application. Claims 1, 14, and 28 have been amended. Claims 2-4, 17, and 18 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 35-37 have been added.

We respectfully submit that no additional claim fees are required because the number of claims that were canceled exceeds the number of added claims. The total number of claims pending in this application has not increased. The number of independent claims remains unchanged at two.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C §112 as indefinite because the word "foldably" in claim 1 was misspelled. Claim 1 had been amended to correct the typographical error. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration of this rejection.

The Examiner also rejected claims 14-34 under 35 U.S.C §112 as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner objected to the terms "the base panel", "the tab", and "the side panel". Claim 14 has been amended to refer to the base panels and side panels in the plural and "the tab" has been replaced with the expression "plurality of tabs". Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration of this rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claim 28-30 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because claim 28 was improperly drafted as a multiple dependent claim. Claim 28 has now been amended so that it only depends from claim 1. New claim 35 has been added which contains the same limitation as claim 28 but depends from claim 14. New claims 36 and 37 have also been added which correspond to claims 29 and 30 respectively but depend from new claim 35. In light of the above amendments, the Applicant respectfully requests favourable reconsideration of this rejection.

Appl. No. 10/774,474
Amdt. dated March 19, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 9, 2007

The Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner has found claims 4-12, 18, and 20-26 to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, claim 1 has been rewritten as claim 4 in independent form, and includes the limitations of intervening claims 2 and 3. Claims 2 to 4 have been canceled. Likewise, claim 14 has been rewritten as claim 18 in independent form, and it includes the limitations of intervening claim 17.

In light of the above amendments, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's Section 102 and 103 rejections are moot and claims 1 and 14 are allowable. Because the remaining dependent claims in this application depend from allowable base claims, the Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BERESKIN & PARR

By 
Victor Krichker
Reg. No. 50,198
Tel: 416 957 1699